arXiv:1607.07344v1 [math.FA] 25 Jul 2016

NEWTON AND BOULIGAND DERIVATIVES OF THE SCALAR PLAY AND STOP OPERATOR

MARTIN BROKATE

Abstract. We prove that the play and the stop operator possess Newton and Bouligand derivatives, and exhibit formulas for those derivatives.

1. Introduction.

The aim of this paper is to show that the play and the stop operator possess Newton as well as Bouligand derivatives, and to compute those derivatives. Newton derivatives are needed when one wants to solve equations

$$F(u) = 0$$

for nonsmooth operators F by Newton's method with a better than linear convergence rate. Bouligand derivatives are closely related to Newton derivatives, and may be used to provide sensitivity results as well as optimality conditions for problems involving nonsmooth operators.

The scalar play operator and its twin, the scalar stop operator, act on functions $u : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ and yield functions $w = \mathcal{P}_r[u; z_0]$ and $z = \mathcal{S}_r[u; z_0]$ from $[a, b]$ to $\mathbb{R}$. The number z_0 plays the role of an initial condition. Their definition is given below in Section 6; alternatively, they arise as solution operators of the evolution variational inequality

$$\dot{w}(t) \cdot (\zeta - z(t)) \le 0\,, \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in [-r, r], \tag{1a}$$

$$z(t) \in [-r, r]\,, \quad z_0 \in [-r, r]\,, \tag{1b}$$

$$w(t) + z(t) = u(t)\,. \tag{1c}$$

The play and the stop operator are rate-independent; in fact, they constitute the simplest nontrivial examples of rate-independent operators [Vis, BS, K, MR] if one disregards relays whose nature is inherently discontinuous. Due to (1c), their mathematical properties are closely related.

A lot is known about the play and the stop. Viewed as operators between function spaces, their typical regularity is Lipschitz (or less). In particular, they are not continuously differentiable. The question whether weaker derivatives (e.g., directional derivatives) exist was addressed, to the author's knowledge, for the first time in [BK] where it was shown that the play and the stop are directionally differentiable from $C[a, b]$ to $L^p(a, b)$ for $p < \infty$. (This is not to be confused with the existence and form of derivatives of functions like $t \mapsto \mathcal{P}_r[u; z_0](t)$, for which there are many results available.)

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47H30, 47J40, 49J52, 49M15, 58C20.

Key words and phrases. rate independence, hysteresis operator, Newton derivative, Bouligand derivative, play, stop, maximum functional.

The results below serve to narrow the gap between differentiability and non-differentiability of rate-independent operators. They are based on the same idea as in [BK], namely, to locally represent the play as a composition of operators whose main ingredient is the accumulated maximum.

The proofs of Newton and of Bouligand differentiability are rather similar. Nevertheless, we have chosen to elaborate them both, because the details are somewhat cumbersome and should not be placed as a burden on the reader.

The main results are given in Theorem 7.6 for the Newton derivative and in equation (109) for the Bouligand derivative. In Section 9, a slight strengthening of those results is proved, having in mind applications to partial differential equations in which the play or stop operator appear.

2. Notions of derivatives.

We collect some established notions of derivatives for mappings

$$F : U \to Y\,, \quad U \subset X\,,$$

where X and Y are normed spaces, and U is an open subset of X. These notions are classical, but the terminology is not uniform in the literature.

Definition 2.1. *(i) The limit, if it exists,*

$$F'(u;h) := \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{F(u+\lambda h) - F(u)}{\lambda}\,, \quad u \in U\,,\ h \in X\,, \tag{2}$$

is called the ***directional derivative*** *of F at u in the direction h. It is an element of Y.*
(ii) If the directional derivative satisfies

$$F'(u;h) = \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{F(u+\lambda h + r(\lambda)) - F(u)}{\lambda} \tag{3}$$

for all functions $r : (0, \lambda_0) \to X$ with $r(\lambda)/\lambda \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$, it is called the ***Hadamard derivative*** *of F at u in the direction h.*
(iii) If the directional derivative exists for all $h \in X$ and satisfies

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{\|F(u+h) - F(u) - F'(u;h)\|}{\|h\|} = 0\,, \tag{4}$$

it is called the ***Bouligand derivative*** *of F at u in the direction h.*
(iv) If the Bouligand derivative has the form $F'(u;h) = Lh$ for some linear continuous mapping $L : X \to Y$, then L is called the ***Fréchet derivative*** *of F at u and denoted as $DF(u)$.*
(v) The mapping F is called directionally (Hadamard, Bouligand, Fréchet, resp.) differentiable at u (in U, resp.), if the corresponding derivative exists at u (for all $u \in U$, resp.) for all directions $h \in X$. □

In the definition above, it is tacitly understood that the limits are taken in the sense "notequal 0".

The following well-known fact is an elementary consequence of the above definitions.

Lemma 2.2. *If F is directionally differentiable and locally Lipschitz continuous at $u \in U$, then F is Hadamard differentiable at u.* □

The notion of a Newton derivative is more recent. A mapping $G : U \to \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$, the space of all linear and continuous mappings from X to Y, is called a Newton derivative of F in U, if

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{\|F(u+h) - F(u) - G(u+h)h\|}{\|h\|} = 0 \tag{5}$$

holds for all $u \in U$. It is never unique; for example, modifying G at a single point does not affect the validity of (5) in U.

It turns out to be natural to allow Newton derivatives to be set-valued. For set-valued mappings we write "$f : X \rightrightarrows Y$" instead of "$f : X \to \mathcal{P}(Y) \setminus \emptyset$".

Definition 2.3. *A mapping $G : U \rightrightarrows \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ is called a **Newton derivative** of F in U, if*

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \sup_{L\in G(u+h)} \frac{\|F(u+h) - F(u) - Lh\|}{\|h\|} = 0 \tag{6}$$

*holds for all $u \in U$. G is called **locally bounded** if for every $u \in U$ the sets $\{\|L\| : L \in G(v), \|v - u\| \le \varepsilon\}$ are bounded for some suitable $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(u)$.*

If $G : U \rightrightarrows \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ is a Newton derivative of F in U, then every $\tilde{G} : U \to \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ satisfying $\tilde{G}(u) \in G(u)$ for all $u \in U$ yields a single-valued Newton derivative of F in U.

If F is continuously Fréchet differentiable in U, then $G(u) = \{DF(u)\}$ is a single-valued Newton derivative of F in U.

The following result (Lemma 8.11 in [IK]) shows that Bouligand and Newton derivatives are closely related.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $F : U \to Y$ possess the single-valued Newton derivative $D^N F : U \to \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. Then F is Bouligand differentiable at $u \in U$ if and only if the limit $\lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} D^N F(u + \lambda h)h$ exists uniformly w.r.t. $h \in X$ with $\|h\| = 1$. In this case,*

$$F'(u; h) = \lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} D^N F(u + \lambda h)h\,. \tag{7}$$

□

3. The chain rule.

For the differentiability notions given in Definition 2.1 we present the corresponding versions of the chain rule. They are well known.

Lemma 3.1. *If F_1 and F_2 are Hadamard differentiable at u resp. $F_1(u)$, then $F_2 \circ F_1$ is Hadamard differentiable at u, and the chain rule*

$$(F_2 \circ F_1)'(u; h) = F_2'(F_1(u); F_1'(u; h)) \tag{8}$$

holds for all $h \in X$. □

Proof. See e.g. [BoS], Proposition 2.47. □

Proposition 3.2. *Let X, Y, Z be normed spaces, let $U \subset X$ and $V \subset Y$ be open. Let $F_1 : U \to Y$ with $F_1(U) \subset V$ and $F_2 : V \to Z$ be locally Lipschitz and Bouligand differentiable at $u \in U$ resp. $F_1(u)$. Then $F_2 \circ F_1$ is Bouligand differentiable at u, and the chain rule (8) holds for all $h \in X$.*

Proof. The proposition is a special case of Proposition 9.3 given below, setting there $X = \tilde{X}$ and $Y = \tilde{Y}$. □

Proposition 3.3. *Let X, Y, Z be normed spaces, let $U \subset X$ and $V \subset Y$ be open. Let $F_1 : U \to Y$ with $F_1(U) \subset V$ and $F_2 : V \to Z$ be locally Lipschitz and possess Newton derivatives $G_1 : U \rightrightarrows Y$ resp. $G_2 : V \rightrightarrows Z$, let G_2 be locally bounded. Then*

$$(G_2 \circ G_1)(u) = \{L_2 \circ L_1 : L_1 \in G_1(u), L_2 \in G_2(F_1(u))\} \tag{9}$$

defines a Newton derivative $G_2 \circ G_1 : U \rightrightarrows Z$ of $F_2 \circ F_1$.

Proof. See Proposition 3.8 in [Ulb11] for the set-valued and Proposition A.1 in [HK09]) for the single-valued case. □

Note that the assumption "G_2 locally bounded" already implies that F_2 is locally Lipschitz.

4. The maximum functional

We consider $\varphi : C[a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\varphi(u) = \max_{s\in[a,b]} u(s)\,. \tag{10}$$

It is well known (see e.g. [Gir]) that φ is directionally differentiable on $C[a,b]$ equipped with the maximum norm, and that

$$\varphi'(u;h) = \max_{s\in M(u)} h(s)\,, \tag{11}$$

where

$$M(u) = \{\tau \in [a,b],\ u(\tau) = \varphi(u)\} \tag{12}$$

is the set where u attains its maximum. Moreover, φ is Hadamard differentiable due to Lemma 2.2, since φ is globally Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant 1.

We investigate spaces $X \subset C[a,b]$ for which

- the directional derivative of φ given by (11) is a Bouligand derivative,
- φ has a Newton derivative.

Let $\mathcal{M}[a,b]$ denote the space of all signed regular Borel measures on $[a,b]$, it is isomorphic to the dual $C[a,b]^*$ of $C[a,b]$. For $u \in C[a,b]$, let us define $\Phi : C[a,b] \rightrightarrows \mathcal{L}(C[a,b],\mathbb{R}) = C[a,b]^*$ by

$$\Phi(u) = \{\mu : \mu \in \mathcal{M}[a,b],\ \mathrm{supp}(\mu) \subset M(u),\ \mu \geq 0,\ \|\mu\| = 1\}\,. \tag{13}$$

In particular, if u has a unique maximum at $r \in [a,b]$, that is, $M(u) = \{r\}$, then $\Phi(u) = \{\delta_r\}$, where δ_r denotes the Dirac delta at r.

Actually, this set $\Phi(u)$ coincides with $\partial\varphi(u)$, the subdifferential of $\varphi : C[a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ at u in the sense of convex analysis. However, it turns out that Φ is not a Newton derivative of φ on $C[a,b]$. In fact, on $X = W^{1,1}(a,b)$ (and hence, on $C[a,b]$ as well), neither is Φ a Newton derivative of φ, nor is φ Bouligand differentiable. This can be seen from the following example. Here and in the sequel, we use the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}} = |u(a)| + \|u'\|_p = |u(a)| + \Big(\int_a^b |u'(s)|^p\,ds\Big)^{1/p}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty\,.$$

Example 4.1. Consider $u : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $u(s) = 1 - s$. We have $\varphi(u) = 1$ and $M(u) = \{0\}$. Define $h_\lambda : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ for $\lambda > 0$ by

$$h_\lambda(s) = \begin{cases} 2s\,, & s \le \lambda\,, \\ 2\lambda\,, & s > \lambda\,. \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

Then the function $u + h_\lambda$ attains its maximum at $s = \lambda$, and

$$\|h_\lambda\|_{1,1} = 2\lambda\,, \quad \varphi(u + h_\lambda) = 1 + \lambda\,, \quad \varphi'(u; h_\lambda) = \max_{s \in M(u)} h_\lambda(s) = h_\lambda(0) = 0\,.$$

Consequently, $\|h_\lambda\|_{1,1} \to 0$ but

$$\frac{|\varphi(u + h_\lambda) - \varphi(u) - \varphi'(u; h_\lambda)|}{\|h_\lambda\|_{1,1}} = \frac{\lambda}{2\lambda} = \frac{1}{2}\,. \tag{15}$$

Thus, $\varphi : C[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is not Bouligand differentiable at u on $X = W^{1,1}(a,b)$. (This argument is actually identically to the one given in [BK] for $X = C[0,1]$, since $\|h_\lambda\|_{1,1} = \|h_\lambda\|_\infty = 2\lambda$.) Moreover,

$$M(u + h_\lambda) = \{\lambda\}\,, \quad \Phi(u + h_\lambda) = \{\delta_\lambda\}\,, \quad \Phi(u + h_\lambda)h_\lambda = h_\lambda(\lambda) = 2\lambda\,,$$

so

$$\frac{|\varphi(u + h_\lambda) - \varphi(u) - \Phi(u + h_\lambda)h_\lambda|}{\|h_\lambda\|_{1,1}} = \frac{\lambda}{2\lambda} = \frac{1}{2}\,. \tag{16}$$

Thus, Φ is not a Newton derivative of φ on $W^{1,1}(0,1)$. □

We will show that Φ is a Newton derivative of φ on $C^{0,\alpha}[a,b]$ for every $\alpha > 0$, endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} = |u(a)| + \sup_{\substack{t,s \in [a,b] \\ s \ne t}} \frac{|u(t) - u(s)|}{|t - s|}\,.$$

For this purpose, we define

$$M_\delta(u) = \{\tau : \tau \in [a,b],\, u(\tau) \ge \varphi(u) - \delta\}\,. \tag{17}$$

We set $B_\varepsilon = (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $u \in C[a,b]$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$M_\delta(u) \subset M(u) + B_\varepsilon\,. \tag{18}$$

Proof. By contradiction. Let us assume that

$$\exists\, \varepsilon > 0 \quad \forall\, \delta > 0 : \quad M_\delta(u) \not\subset M(u) + B_\varepsilon\,.$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we choose $t_n \in M_{1/n}(u)$ such that $t_n \notin M(u) + B_\varepsilon$. Then

$$u(t_n) \ge \varphi(u) - \frac{1}{n}\,, \quad d(t_n, M(u)) \ge \varepsilon\,.$$

Here, $d(t_n, M(u))$ denotes the distance of t_n from $M(u)$. Let $\{t_{n_k}\}$ be a convergent subsequence, say $t_{n_k} \to t$. Then by continuity we have $u(t) = \varphi(u)$ and $d(t, M(u)) \ge \varepsilon$, a contradiction. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $u, h \in C[a,b]$. Then*

$$\|h\|_\infty \le \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad M(u + h) \subset M_{2\delta}(u)\,. \tag{19}$$

holds for all $\delta > 0$.

Proof. If $t \in M(u+h)$, we have for all $s \in [a,b]$

$$u(t) + h(t) = \varphi(u+h) \geq u(s) + h(s) \geq u(s) - \|h\|_\infty$$

and thus $u(t) \geq \varphi(u) - 2\|h\|_\infty \geq \varphi(u) - 2\delta$ whenever $\|h\|_\infty \leq \delta$. □

Lemma 4.4. *The mapping $M : C[a,b] \rightrightarrows [a,b]$ is upper semicontinuous, that is, for every $u \in C[a,b]$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every $h \in C[a,b]$*

$$\|h\|_\infty \leq \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad M(u+h) \subset M(u) + B_\varepsilon \,. \tag{20}$$

Proof. This is a consequence of Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3. □

For a function $f : I \to \mathbb{R}$, I being an interval, we denote the modulus of continuity of f on I by

$$\omega_I(f;\varepsilon) = \sup\{|f(t) - f(s)| : t, s \in I \,,\, |t-s| \leq \varepsilon\} \,. \tag{21}$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $u, h \in C[a,b]$, $\mu \in \Phi(u+h)$. Then*

$$\varphi'(u;h) \leq \varphi(u+h) - \varphi(u) \leq \langle \mu, h \rangle \,. \tag{22}$$

If moreover

$$M(u+h) \subset M(u) + B_\varepsilon \tag{23}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$, we also have

$$\langle \mu, h \rangle - \varphi'(u;h) \leq \sup_{|s-r| \leq \varepsilon} |h(r) - h(s)| = \omega_{[a,b]}(h;\varepsilon) \,. \tag{24}$$

Proof. The first inequality in (22) holds since φ is convex. In order to prove the second inequality, let $r \in \operatorname{supp}(\mu) \subset M(u+h)$ be arbitrary. Then

$$\varphi(u+h) - \varphi(u) = u(r) + h(r) - \varphi(u) \leq h(r) \,.$$

Since $\mu \geq 0$ and $\|\mu\| = 1$, it follows that

$$\varphi(u+h) - \varphi(u) = \int_a^b \varphi(u+h) - \varphi(u)\, d\mu(r) \leq \int_a^b h(r)\, d\mu(r) = \langle \mu, h \rangle \,.$$

Now assume that (23) holds. Given $r \in \operatorname{supp}(\mu) \subset M(u+h)$ we find an $s_r \in M(u)$ with $|r - s_r| \leq \varepsilon$, so

$$h(r) - \varphi'(u;h) = h(r) - \max_{s \in M(u)} h(s) \leq h(r) - h(s_r) \leq \omega_{[a,b]}(h;\varepsilon) \,.$$

Integrating both sides of this inequality with respect to μ yields (24). □

Lemma 4.6. *Let $u \in C[a,b]$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1/p + 1/p' = 1$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the following holds: For every $h \in C[a,b]$ with $\|h\|_\infty < \delta$ and every $\mu \in \Phi(u+h)$ we have*

$$0 \leq \langle \mu, h \rangle - \varphi'(u;h) \leq \omega_{[a,b]}(h;\varepsilon) \,, \tag{25}$$

and moreover, if $h \in C^{0,\alpha}[a,b]$,

$$0 \leq \langle \mu, h \rangle - \varphi'(u;h) \leq \|h\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \cdot \varepsilon^\alpha \tag{26}$$

as well as, if $h \in W^{1,p}(a,b)$,

$$0 \leq \langle \mu, h \rangle - \varphi'(u;h) \leq \|h'\|_{L^p} \cdot \varepsilon^{1/p'} \,, \tag{27}$$

if h belongs to the corresponding spaces.

Proof. The estimate (25) immediately follows from Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.4. Since for all $r, s \in [a, b]$

$$|h(r) - h(s)| \le \|h\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \cdot \varepsilon^\alpha$$

as well as

$$|h(r) - h(s)| \le \int_{[r,s]} |h'(\tau)|\, d\tau \le \|h'\|_{L^p} |r - s|^{p'},$$

the remaining assertions follow from (25). □

Proposition 4.7. *Let X denote any one of the spaces $C^{0,\alpha}[a, b]$ or $W^{1,p}(a, b)$, with $0 < \alpha \le 1$ resp. $1 < p \le \infty$. Then the mapping Φ defined in (13) is a globally bounded Newton derivative of the maximum functional φ on X. In particular, for every $u \in X$ there exists a nondecreasing and bounded $\rho_u : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\rho_u(\delta) \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$ and*

$$|\varphi(u + h) - \varphi(u) - Lh| \le \begin{cases} \rho_u(\|h\|_\infty)\|h\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \\ \rho_u(\|h\|_\infty)\|h'\|_{L^p} \end{cases} \tag{28}$$

respectively, for every $h \in X$ and every $\mu \in \Phi(u + h)$.

Moreover, φ is Bouligand differentiable on X, and for every $u \in X$

$$|\varphi(u + h) - \varphi(u) - \varphi'(u; h)| \le \begin{cases} \rho_u(\|h\|_\infty)\|h\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \\ \rho_u(\|h\|_\infty)\|h'\|_{L^p} \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

respectively, for every $h \in X$.

Proof. Let $u \in X$ be given. According to (22), (26) and (27), for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $h \in X$ and all $\mu \in \Phi(u + h)$

$$\|h\|_\infty \le \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad |\varphi(u + h) - \varphi(u) - Lh| \le \|h\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \cdot \varepsilon^\alpha \tag{30}$$

resp. $\le \|h'\|_{L^p} \varepsilon^{1/p'}$. Let

$$\varepsilon_u(\delta) = \inf\{\varepsilon : (30) \text{ holds}\}, \qquad \rho_u(\delta) = \varepsilon_u(\delta)^\alpha \quad \text{resp.} \quad \varepsilon_u(\delta)^{1/p'}.$$

This proves (28). That Φ is globally bounded follows immediately from its definition in (13) and the continuity of the embeddings from X to $C[a, b]$. Concerning Bouligand differentiability, in order to estimate $|\varphi(u+h)-\varphi(u)-\varphi'(u; h)|$ as required we again use (22), (26) and (27). □

Note that the estimates (28) and (29) are slightly stronger than required for Newton and Bouligand differentiability (the factor $\rho_u(\|h\|_X)$ instead of $\rho_u(\|h\|_\infty)$ would suffice). They are motivated by applications to partial differential equations.

Since $W^{1,p}(a, b)$ is continuously embedded into $C^{0,\alpha}[a, b]$ for $\alpha \le 1 - 1/p$ by Morrey's theorem, the assertions concerning differentiability on $C^{0,\alpha}[a, b]$ actually imply those concerning $W^{1,p}(a, b)$. But, as the above exposition shows, a reference to that theorem would not shorten the argument and moreover introduce an additional constant in (27).

5. The accumulated maximum

We define the accumulated (or "gliding") maximum of a function $u \in C[a,b]$ as

$$\varphi_t(u) = \max_{s\in[a,t]} u(s)\,, \quad t \in [a,b]\,. \tag{31}$$

Setting

$$(Fu)(t) = \varphi_t(u) \tag{32}$$

we obtain an operator

$$F : C[a,b] \to C[a,b]\,. \tag{33}$$

Obviously, the function Fu is nondecreasing for every $u \in C[a,b]$. Since

$$|\varphi_t(u) - \varphi_t(v)| \le \max_{s\in[a,t]} |u(s) - v(s)|\,, \quad \text{for all } u, v \in C[a,b],$$

we have

$$\|Fu - Fv\|_\infty \le \|u - v\|_\infty\,, \quad \text{for all } u, v \in C[a,b]. \tag{34}$$

For any fixed $t \in [a,b]$, the directional derivative of $\varphi_t : C[a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ given in (11) yields that, for all $u, h \in C[a,b]$,

$$F^{PD}(u;h)(t) := \lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} \frac{(F(u+\lambda h))(t) - (Fu)(t)}{\lambda} = \varphi_t'(u;h) = \max_{s\in M_t(u)} h(s)\,, \tag{35}$$

where

$$M_t(u) = \{\tau \in [a,t],\, u(\tau) = \varphi_t(u)\} \tag{36}$$

is the set where u attains its maximum on $[a,t]$. As in [BK], we call **pointwise directional derivative of F** the function $F^{PD}(u;h) : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ obtained in this manner.

There arises the question whether the function $F^{PD}(u;h)$ is a derivative of F according to the notions in Definition 2.1. This depends on the choice of the function spaces X and Y for $F : X \to Y$. It has been shown in [BK] that $F : C[a,b] \to C[a,b]$ is not directionally differentiable, while $F : C[a,b] \to L^q(a,b)$ with $1 \le q < \infty$ is Hadamard differentiable, but not Bouligand differentiable.

But it turns out that, on the basis of the considerations of the previous section, we can show that F is Newton and Bouligand differentiable when we choose X as a Hölder or a Sobolev space.

Let us construct a Newton derivative of F; as before, we do this pointwise in time. As an approximation Lh to $F(u+h) - F(u)$ we choose

$$(Lh)(t) = \langle \mu_t, h\rangle\,, \quad \mu_t \in \Phi_t(u+h)\,, \quad t \in [a,b]\,, \tag{37}$$

where $\Phi_t : C[a,b] \rightrightarrows C[a,b]^*$ is given by

$$\Phi_t(u) = \{\nu : \nu \in \mathcal{M}[a,b],\, \mathrm{supp}(\nu) \subset M_t(u),\, \nu \ge 0,\, \|\nu\| = 1\}\,. \tag{38}$$

For $u \in C[a,b]$, let us define

$$G(u) = \{\mu |\ \mu : [a,b] \to \mathcal{M}[a,b] \text{ weakly measurable, } \mu_t \in \Phi_t(u) \text{ for all } t\}\,. \tag{39}$$

We write μ_t instead of $\mu(t)$; "weakly measurable" means that $t \mapsto \langle \mu_t, h\rangle$ is measurable for every $h \in C[a,b]$.

Lemma 5.1. *The set $G(u)$ is nonempty for every $u \in C[a,b]$.*

Proof. Let $m(t) = \max M_t(u)$. If $t < s$ we have either $\varphi_t(u) = \varphi_s(u)$ and $M_t(u) \subset M_s(u)$, or $\varphi_t(u) < \varphi_s(u)$ and $m(t) \le t < m(s)$. Thus, m is nondecreasing and hence measurable. Setting $\mu_t = \delta_{m(t)}$ we obtain an element $\mu \in G(u)$, because $t \mapsto \langle \mu_t, h\rangle = h(m(t))$ is measurable for every $h \in C[a,b]$. □

In analogy to (17) we define

$$M_{t,\delta}(u) = \{\tau : a \le \tau \le t\,,\ u(\tau) \ge \varphi_t(u) - \delta\}\,. \tag{40}$$

For any fixed $t \in [a,b]$, the results of the previous section from Lemma 4.2 to Lemma 4.5 continue to hold for M_t and $M_{t,\delta}$ in place of M and M_δ, as we may replace $[a,b]$ by $[a,t]$. For example, the statement of Lemma 4.2 becomes

$$\forall\, t \in [a,b] \quad \forall\, \varepsilon > 0 \quad \exists\, \delta > 0 : \quad M_{t,\delta}(u) \subset M_t(u) + B_\varepsilon\,.$$

Unfortunately, the "uniform" statement

$$\forall\, \varepsilon > 0 \quad \exists\, \delta > 0 \quad \forall\, t \in [a,b] : \quad M_{t,\delta}(u) \subset M_t(u) + B_\varepsilon \tag{41}$$

typically does **not** hold when the maximizer of u is not unique. As an example, consider

$$u(t) = |t-1|\,, \quad u : [0,2] \to \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{42}$$

For $2 - \delta < t < 2$ we have

$$\varphi_t(u) = 1\,,\ M_t(u) = \{0\}\,,\ M_t(u) + B_\varepsilon = [0,\varepsilon)\,,\ M_{t,\delta}(u) = [0,\delta] \cup [2-\delta, t]\,,$$

so (41) does not hold.

It turns out, however, that the complement of the set

$$A^\varepsilon_\delta(u) = \{t : t \in [a,b], M_{t,\delta}(u) \subset M_t(u) + B_\varepsilon\} \tag{43}$$

becomes small as δ becomes small. First, note that

$$\delta < \eta \quad \Rightarrow \quad M_{t,\delta} \subset M_{t,\eta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad A^\varepsilon_\delta(u) \supset A^\varepsilon_\eta(u)\,. \tag{44}$$

Moreover, we get

Lemma 5.2. *Let $u \in C[a,b]$. Then*

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \operatorname{meas}\left([a,b] \setminus A^\varepsilon_\delta(u)\right) = 0 \tag{45}$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Let $t \in [a,b]$. From Lemma 4.2, applied to φ_t, we get

$$\bigcup_{\delta > 0} A^\varepsilon_\delta(u) = [a,b]\,, \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0. \tag{46}$$

Together with (44), the assertion follows. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let $u \in C[a,b]$, $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then for all $\gamma \in (a,b]$, all $h \in C[a,b]$ with $\|h\|_{\infty,\gamma} \le \delta$ and all $\mu \in G(u+h)$ we have*

$$\varphi'_t(u;h) \le \varphi_t(u+h) - \varphi_t(u) \le \langle \mu_t, h\rangle\,, \quad \textit{for all } t \in [a,\gamma], \tag{47}$$

as well as

$$0 \le \langle \mu_t, h\rangle - \varphi'_t(u;h) \le \omega_{[a,\gamma]}(h;\varepsilon)\,, \quad \textit{for all } t \in A^\varepsilon_{2\delta}(u) \cap [a,\gamma]. \tag{48}$$

Proof. We immediately obtain (47) from the corresponding statement (22) in Lemma 4.5. To prove (48), for $t \in A^\varepsilon_{2\delta}(u)$ we have $M_{t,2\delta}(u) \subset M_t(u) + B_\varepsilon$ by definition, and $M_t(u+h) \subset M_{t,2\delta}(u)$ by Lemma 4.3. Thus, $M_t(u+h) \subset M_t(u) + B_\varepsilon$ for every $t \in A^\varepsilon_{2\delta}(u)$. We may now apply the second part of Lemma 4.5 to conclude that (48) holds. □

Proposition 5.4. *Let $u \in C[a,b]$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \le q < \infty$, $0 < \alpha \le 1$, let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $\gamma \in (a,b]$ and all $h \in C[a,b]$ with $\|h\|_{\infty,\gamma} \le \delta$ and all $L \in G(u+h)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(u+h) - F(u) - Lh\|^q_{L^q(a,\gamma)} \\ \|F(u+h) - F(u) - F^{PD}(u;h)\|^q_{L^q(a,\gamma)} \end{aligned} \quad \le (b-a)\Big[\omega_{[a,\gamma]}(h;\varepsilon) + 2\varepsilon\|h\|_{\infty,\gamma}\Big]^q . \tag{49}$$

Proof. Let $(Lh)(t) = \langle \mu_t, h\rangle$ according to (39), let $h \in C[a,b]$ with $\|h\|_{\infty,\gamma} \le \delta$. We have

$$\|F(u+h) - F(u) - Lh\|^q_{L^q(a,\gamma)} = \int_a^\gamma |\varphi_t(u+h) - \varphi_t(u) - \langle \mu_t, h\rangle|^q \, dt\,. \tag{50}$$

For every $t \in A^\varepsilon_{2\delta}(u) \cap [a,\gamma]$ we have, due to Lemma 5.3,

$$|\varphi_t(u+h) - \varphi_t(u) - \langle \mu_t, h\rangle| \le \omega_{[a,\gamma]}(h;\varepsilon)\,. \tag{51}$$

Since we obviously have

$$|\varphi_t(u+h) - \varphi_t(u) - \langle \mu_t, h\rangle| \le 2\|h\|_{\infty,\gamma}\,, \quad \text{for all } t \in [a,\gamma],$$

we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^\gamma |\varphi_t(u+h) - \varphi_t(u) - \langle \mu_t, h\rangle|^q \, dt &= \int_{[a,\gamma]\cap A^\varepsilon_{2\delta}(u)} \dots \, dt + \int_{[a,\gamma]\setminus A^\varepsilon_{2\delta}(u)} \dots \, dt \\ &\le (b-a)(\omega_{[a,\gamma]}(h;\varepsilon))^q + 2^q\|h\|^q_{\infty,\gamma}\mathrm{meas}([a,b]\setminus A^\varepsilon_{2\delta}(u))\,. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

According to Lemma 5.2 we choose $\delta > 0$ such that

$$2^q \mathrm{meas}([a,b]\setminus A^\varepsilon_{2\delta}(u)) \le \varepsilon^q (b-a)\,.$$

Then the first inequality in (49) follows from (52) and from the fact that $x^q + y^q \le (x+y)^q$ whenever $x, y \ge 0$. To get the second inequality in (49), we replace in the above proof the expression $|\varphi_t(u+h) - \varphi_t(u) - \langle \mu_t, h\rangle|$ by the expression $|\varphi_t(u+h) - \varphi_t(u) - \varphi'(u;h)|$. □

We now prove that the accumulated maximum is Newton and Bouligand differentiable. For the convenience of the reader, we repeat the definition of the set-valued mapping G:

$$\begin{aligned} G(u) &= \{\mu |\ \mu : [a,b] \to \mathcal{M}[a,b] \text{ weakly measurable, } \mu_t \in \Phi_t(u) \text{ for all } t\}\,, \\ \Phi_t(u) &= \{\nu : \nu \in \mathcal{M}[a,b],\, \mathrm{supp}(\nu) \subset M_t(u),\, \nu \ge 0,\, \|\nu\| = 1\}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

An element $L \in G(u)$ has the form

$$(Lh)(t) = \langle \mu_t, h\rangle\,, \quad \mu_t \in \Phi_t(u)\,, \quad t \in [a,b]\,. \tag{54}$$

Proposition 5.5. *The accumulated maximum $F : X \to L^q(a,b)$ is Newton as well as Bouligand differentiable, where $X = C^{0,\alpha}[a,b]$ or $X = W^{1,p}(a,b)$. A Newton derivative $G : X \to \mathcal{L}(X; L^q(a,b))$ is given by (53), it is globally bounded.*
(i) More precisely, for every $u \in X$ there exists $\rho_u : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$, nondecreasing and bounded, with $\rho_u(\delta) \downarrow 0$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$ such that

$$\|F(u+h) - F(u) - Lh\|_{L^q(a,\gamma)} \le \rho_u(\|h\|_{C[a,\gamma]}) \cdot \|h\|_{X_\gamma}\,, \tag{55}$$

holds for all $h \in X$, $L \in G(u+h)$ and $\gamma \in (a,b]$. Here, X_γ stands for $C^{0,\alpha}[a,\gamma]$ and $W^{1,p}(a,\gamma)$, respectively.
(ii) Moreover,

$$\|F(u+h) - F(u) - F^{PD}(u;h)\|_{L^q(a,\gamma)} \le \rho_u(\|h\|_{C[a,\gamma]}) \cdot \|h\|_{X_\gamma}\,, \tag{56}$$

holds for all $h \in X$ and all $\gamma \in (a,b]$.

Proof. Let us prove (55) for $X = C^{0,\alpha}[a,b]$. As

$$\omega_{[a,\gamma]}(h;\varepsilon) \le \varepsilon^\alpha \|h\|_{C^{0,\alpha}[a,\gamma]}\,, \tag{57}$$

Proposition 5.4 shows that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(u+h) - F(u) - Lh\|^q_{L^q(a,\gamma)} &\le (b-a)(\varepsilon^\alpha + 2\varepsilon)^q \|h\|^q_{C^{0,\alpha}[a,\gamma]} \\ \forall\, \gamma \in (a,b],\ h \in C[a,b] \text{ with } \|h\|_{\infty,\gamma} &\le \delta,\ L \in G(u+h). \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

For a given $\delta > 0$ we define

$$\varepsilon_u(\delta) = \inf\{\varepsilon : (58) \text{ holds}\}\,. \tag{59}$$

Then $\varepsilon_u(\delta)$ is well-defined and nondecreasing on some interval $(0,\delta_0)$, and $\varepsilon_u(\delta) > 0$ as well as $\varepsilon_u(\delta) \downarrow 0$ for $\delta \downarrow 0$ due to Proposition 5.4. We set

$$\rho_u(\delta) = (b-a)^{1/q}(\varepsilon_u(\delta)^\alpha + 2\varepsilon_u(\delta))\,.$$

Thus, (55) holds for $X = C^{0,\alpha}[a,b]$. In order to prove it for $X = W^{1,p}(a,b)$, we first recall that

$$\omega_{[a,\gamma]}(h;\varepsilon) \le \varepsilon^{1/p'} \|h\|_{W^{1,p}[a,\gamma]}\,. \tag{60}$$

Observing that

$$\|h\|_{\infty,\gamma} \le c_p \|h\|_{W^{1,p}(a,\gamma)}$$

for some constant c_p, we replace $\varepsilon^\alpha + 2\varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon^{1/p'} + 2c_p\varepsilon$ in (58) and define ρ_u by

$$\rho_u(\delta) = (b-a)^{1/q}(\varepsilon_u(\delta)^{1/p'} + 2c_p\varepsilon_u(\delta))\,.$$

With these modifications, the proof proceeds as before. (Alternatively, we might replace the second part of the proof by a reference to Morrey's embedding theorem.)

To prove (56), we just have to replace $F(u+h) - F(u) - Lh$ in (58) by $F(u+h) - F(u) - F^{PD}(u;h)$ and use the second inequality in (49) instead of the first.

That G is globally bounded follows from the estimate, valid for all $u \in X$ and all $L \in G(u)$,

$$\|Lh\|^q_{L^q} = \int_a^b |\langle \mu_t, h\rangle|^q\, dt \le \int_a^b \|\mu_t\|^q_{X\to\mathbb{R}} \|h\|^q_X\, dt \le (b-a)c^q \|h\|^q_X$$

for some suitable constant c. □

6. The scalar play and stop operators

The original construction of the play and the stop operators in [KDE70] is based on piecewise monotone input functions. A continuous function $u : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is called **piecewise monotone**, if the restriction of u to each interval $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ of a suitably chosen partition $\Delta = \{t_i\}$, $a = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_N = b$, called a **monotonicity partition** of u, is either nondecreasing or nonincreasing. By $C_{pm}[a, b]$ we denote the space of all such functions.

For arbitrary $r \geq 0$, the play operator $\mathcal{P}_r$ and the stop operator $\mathcal{S}_r$ are constructed as follows. (For more details, we refer to Section 2.3 of [BS].) Given a function $u \in C_{pm}[a, b]$ and an initial value $z_0 \in [-r, r]$, we define functions $w, z : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ successively on the intervals $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $0 \leq i < N$, of a monotonicity partition Δ of u by

$$z(a) = \pi_r(z_0) := \max\{-r, \min\{r, z_0\}\}\,, \quad w(a) = u(a) - z(a)\,, \tag{61}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} w(t) &= \max\{u(t) - r\,,\, \min\{u(t) + r, w(t_i)\}\}\,, \\ z(t) &= v(t) - w(t)\,, \end{aligned} \qquad t_i < t \leq t_{i+1}\,. \tag{62}$$

In this manner, we obtain operators

$$w = \mathcal{P}_r[u; z_0]\,, \quad z = \mathcal{S}_r[u; z_0]\,, \quad \mathcal{P}_r : C_{pm}[a, b] \times \mathbb{R} \to C_{pm}[a, b]\,.$$

By construction,

$$u = w + z = \mathcal{P}_r[u; z_0] + \mathcal{S}_r[u; z_0]\,. \tag{63}$$

The play operator satisfies

$$\|\mathcal{P}_r[u; z_0] - \mathcal{P}_r[v; y_0]\| \leq \max\{\|u - v\|\,,\, |z_0 - y_0|\} \tag{64}$$

for all $u, v \in C_{pm}[a, b]$ and all $z_0, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}_r$ and $\mathcal{S}_r$ can be uniquely extended to Lipschitz continuous operators

$$\mathcal{P}_r, \mathcal{S}_r : C[a, b] \times \mathbb{R} \to C[a, b] \tag{65}$$

which satisfy (64) for all $u, v \in C[a, b]$ and all $z_0, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

The trajectories $\{(u(t), w(t)) : t \in [a, b]\}$ lie within the subset $A = \{|u - w| \leq r\}$ of the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$ whose boundary consists of the straight lines $u - w = \pm r$.

Let $(u, z_0) \in C[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}$ be given, let $w = \mathcal{P}_r[u; z_0]$, $r > 0$. We define the sets of times

$$I_0 = \{t \in [a, b] : |u(t) - w(t)| < r\}\,,$$
$$I_+ = \{t \in [a, b] : u(t) - w(t) = r\}\,, \quad I_- = \{t \in [a, b] : u(t) - w(t) = -r\}$$

where the trajectory of (u, w) lies in the interior of A, or on the right or the left part of ∂A, respectively.

An interval $[t_*, t^*] \subset [a, b]$ is called a **plus interval** for (u, z_0) if $[t_*, t^*] \cap I_- = \emptyset$, and a **minus interval** for (u, z_0) if $[t_*, t^*] \cap I_+ = \emptyset$. It has been proved in [BK], Lemma 5.1, that on such intervals the play operator behaves like an accumulated maximum; more precisely, on a plus interval $[t_*, t^*]$ we have

$$w(t) = \mathcal{P}_r[u; z_0](t) = \psi_+(u, w(t_*); t, t_*)\,, \quad t \in [t_*, t^*]\,, \tag{66}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_+(v,p;t,t_*) &= \max\{p\,,\ \max_{s\in[t_*,t]}(v(s)-r)\}\\ &= p+\max\{0\,,\ \max_{s\in[t_*,t]}(v(s)-r-p)\}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

Correspondingly, on a minus interval we have

$$w(t)=\mathcal{P}_r[u;z_0](t)=\psi_-(u,w(t_*);t,t_*)\,,\quad t\in[t_*,t^*]\,, \tag{68}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_-(v,p;t,t_*) &= \min\{p\,,\ \min_{s\in[t_*,t]}(v(s)+r)\}\\ &= p+\min\{0\,,\ \min_{s\in[t_*,t]}(v(s)+r-p)\}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

The set I_0 is an open subset of $[a,b]$. Nothing more can be said in general, so $I_+\cup I_-$ can be an arbitrary compact subset of $[a,b]$. Nevertheless, I_+ and I_- are separated in the sense that

$$\delta_I:=\min\{|\tau-\sigma|:\tau\in I_+\,,\ \sigma\in I_-\}>0\,, \tag{70}$$

because u,w and z are continuous functions. Based on (70), it has been proved in [BK], Lemma 5.2, that, in a local sense, the play and the stop operator can be represented by a finite composition of operators arising from the accumulated maximum. More precisely, the following result holds.

Proposition 6.1. *For every $(u,z_0)\in C[a,b]\times\mathbb{R}$ there exists a partition $\Delta=\{t_k\}_{0\le k\le N}$ of $[a,b]$ and a $\delta>0$ such that every partition interval $[t_{k-1},t_k]$ of Δ is a plus interval for all $(v,y_0)\in U_\delta\times\mathbb{R}$, or it is a minus interval for all $(v,y_0)\in U_\delta\times\mathbb{R}$. Here,*

$$U_\delta:=\{(v,y_0):\|v-u\|_\infty<\delta,\ |y_0-z_0|<\delta,\ v\in C[a,b],\ y_0\in\mathbb{R}\} \tag{71}$$

is the δ-neighbourhood of (u,z_0) w.r.t the maximum norm. □

7. Newton derivative of the play and the stop

We obtain a Newton derivative for the play operator $\mathcal{P}_r$ from the Newton derivative of the accumulated maximum on the spaces $C^{0,\alpha}[a,b]$ and $W^{1,p}(a,b)$, where $0<\alpha\le 1$ and $1<p\le\infty$. Within this section, X denotes any one of those spaces. We fix $r>0$ and $(u,z_0)\in X\times\mathbb{R}$, and choose Δ and δ according to Proposition 6.1.

We define $\psi_k:(X\cap U_\delta)\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ by (see (61) for the definition of π_r)

$$\begin{aligned}&\psi_0(v,p)=v(a)-\pi_r(p)\,,\\ &\psi_k(v,p)=\psi_\pm(v,p;t_k,t_{k-1})\,,\quad 1\le k\le N\,,\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

depending on whether $[t_{k-1},t_k]$ is a plus or a minus interval. Moreover, we define $w_k:(X\cap U_\delta)\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}&w_0(v,y_0)=\psi_0(v,y_0)=v(a)-\pi_r(y_0)\,,\\ &w_k(v,y_0)=\psi_k(v,w_{k-1}(v,y_0))\,,\quad 1\le k\le N\,.\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

The mapping w_k represents the memory update of the scalar play. According to Proposition 6.1 and (66), (68) we have

$$\mathcal{P}_r[v;y_0](t_k)=w_k(v,y_0)\,,\quad 0\le k\le N\,. \tag{74}$$

We compute a Newton derivative for ψ_k, $k \geq 1$. On a plus interval, we have

$$\psi_k(v,p) = p + \max\{0\,, \max_{s\in[t_{k-1},t_k]}(v(s) - r - p)\}\,. \tag{75}$$

By Proposition 4.7, a Newton derivative for the inner part

$$(v,p) \mapsto \max_{s\in[t_{k-1},t_k]}(v(s) - r - p)$$

is given by the linear and continuous mappings

$$(h,q) \mapsto \langle \mu, h - q\rangle\,,$$

where μ ranges over all probability measures μ whose support is contained in

$$M_k(v) = \{\tau \in [t_{k-1}, t_k] : v(\tau) = \max_{[t_{k-1},t_k]} v\}\,. \tag{76}$$

The outer maximum in (75) is just the positive part function $x \mapsto x_+$ on $\mathbb{R}$. It is well known that the Heaviside function, given by $H(x) = 1$ for $x > 0$ and $H(x) = 0$ otherwise, is a Newton derivative for the positive part function. Analogously, the characteristic function of $(-r, r)$ is a Newton derivative for the function π_r.

Since the assumptions of the chain rule 3.3 are satisfied for the mappings involved here, the considerations above yield Newton derivatives of the functions ψ_k as follows.

Lemma 7.1. *A Newton derivative of ψ_0 is given by*

$$\Psi_0 : (X \cap U_\delta) \times \mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows (X \times \mathbb{R})^*\,, \tag{77}$$

where the elements $L \in \Psi_0(v,p)$ have the form

$$L(h,q) = h(a) - S(p)q\,, \quad S(p) = \begin{cases} 1\,, & -r < p < r\,, \\ 0\,, & \textit{otherwise}\,. \end{cases} \tag{78}$$

□

Lemma 7.2. *On a plus interval, a Newton derivative of ψ_k, $1 \leq k \leq N$, is given by*

$$\Psi_k : (X \cap U_\delta) \times \mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows (X \times \mathbb{R})^*\,, \tag{79}$$

where the elements $L \in \Psi_k(v,p)$ have the form

$$L(h,q) = q + H\big(\max_{s\in[t_{k-1},t_k]}(v(s) - r - p)\big) \cdot \langle \mu, h - q\rangle\,, \tag{80}$$

and

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}[a,b]\,, \quad \operatorname{supp}(\mu) \subset M_k(v) \tag{81}$$

with $M_k(v)$ from (76). This Newton derivative is bounded on $(X \cap U_\delta) \times \mathbb{R}$.
□

Corresponding considerations for ψ_- instead of ψ_+ lead to the Newton derivative of ψ_k on minus intervals.

Lemma 7.3. *On a minus interval, a Newton derivative of ψ_k, $1 \leq k \leq N$, is given by*

$$\Psi_k : (X \cap U_\delta) \times \mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows (X \times \mathbb{R})^*\,, \tag{82}$$

where the elements $L \in \Psi_k(v,p)$ *have the form*

$$L(h,q) = q + H\big(-\min_{s\in[t_{k-1},t_k]}(v(s)+r-p)\big)\cdot\langle\mu, h-q\rangle\,, \tag{83}$$

and

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}[a,b]\,, \quad \operatorname{supp}(\mu) \subset \widetilde{M}_k(v) \tag{84}$$

with

$$\widetilde{M}_k(v) = \{\tau\in[t_{k-1},t_k] : v(\tau) = \min_{[t_{k-1},t]} v\}\,. \tag{85}$$

This Newton derivative is bounded on $(X\cap U_\delta)\times\mathbb{R}$. □

We obtain a Newton derivative of w_k by applying the chain rule in (73).

Lemma 7.4. *A Newton derivative of* w_k, $1\le k\le N$, *is given by*

$$W_k : (X\cap U_\delta)\times\mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows (X\times\mathbb{R})^*\,, \tag{86}$$

where the elements $L_k^W \in W_k(v,y_0)$ *have the form*

$$L_k^W(h,q) = L(h,0) + L(0, L_{k-1}^W(h,q))\,, \tag{87}$$

and $L\in\Psi_k(v,y_0)$ *has the form given in Lemma 7.2 or Lemma 7.3, respectively. This Newton derivative is bounded on* $(X\cap U_\delta)\times\mathbb{R}$. □

In order to obtain a Newton derivative of the play, we define $F_k : X\times\mathbb{R}\to Y_k$ with $Y_k = L^q(t_{k-1},t_k)$, $1\le q<\infty$, by

$$\begin{aligned} F_0(v,p) &= w_0(v,p) = v(a) - \pi_r(p)\,,\\ F_k(v,p)(t) &= \psi_\pm(v,p;t,t_{k-1})\,, \quad 1\le k\le N\,, \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

depending on whether $[t_{k-1},t_k]$ is a plus or a minus interval. A Newton derivative for F_k is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 7.5. *On a plus interval, a Newton derivative of* $F_k : (X\cap U_\delta)\times\mathbb{R}\to L^q(t_{k-1},t_k)$, $1\le k\le N$, *is given by*

$$Z_k : (X\cap U_\delta)\times\mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{L}(X\times\mathbb{R}; L^q(t_{k-1},t_k))\,, \tag{89}$$

where the elements $L\in Z_k(v,p)$ *have the form*

$$L(h,q)(t) = q + H\big(\max_{s\in[t_{k-1},t]}(v(s)-r-p)\big)\cdot\langle\mu_t, h-q\rangle\,. \tag{90}$$

Here, $\mu : [t_{k-1},t_k]\to\mathcal{M}[t_{k-1},t_k]$ *is weakly measurable,* $\mu_t\ge 0$ *and* $\|\mu_t\| = 1$ *for all* $t\in[t_{k-1},t_k]$, *and*

$$\operatorname{supp}(\mu_t) \subset M_{k,t}(v)\,, \tag{91}$$

where

$$M_{k,t}(v) = \{\tau\in[t_{k-1},t_k] : v(\tau) = \max_{[t_{k-1},t]} v\}\,. \tag{92}$$

On a minus interval, the same is true, with (90) replaced by

$$L(h,q)(t) = q + H\big(-\min_{s\in[t_{k-1},t]}(v(s)+r-p)\big)\cdot\langle\mu_t, h-q\rangle\,, \tag{93}$$

and (91) replaced by

$$M_{k,t}(v) = \{\tau\in[t_{k-1},t_k] : v(\tau) = \min_{[t_{k-1},t]} v\}\,. \tag{94}$$

These Newton derivatives are bounded on $(X\cap U_\delta)\times\mathbb{R}$. □

Proof. On a plus interval, we have

$$F_k(v,p)(t) = p + \max\{0\,,\ \max_{s\in[t_{k-1},t]}(v(s) - r - p)\}\,. \tag{95}$$

By Proposition 5.5, a Newton derivative for the inner part

$$(v,p) \mapsto \max_{s\in[t_{k-1},t]}(v(s) - r - p)\,, \quad t \in (t_{k-1},t_k)\,,$$

is given by the linear and continuous mappings

$$(h,q) \mapsto \langle \mu_t, h - q\rangle\,, \quad t \in (t_{k-1},t_k)\,,$$

where μ ranges over the set of measures having the asserted properties. The outer maximum in (95) corresponds to the positive part operator $f \mapsto f_+$ for real-valued functions. Considered as an operator from $L^{\tilde q}(t_{k-1},t_k)$ to $L^q(t_{k-1},t_k)$ with $\tilde q > q$, it has as a single-valued Newton derivative the mapping defined by $L_f(h)(t) = H(f(t))h(t)$ for $f \in L^{\tilde q}$, H being the Heaviside function; see Theorem 3.49 in [Ulb11], Example 8.14 in [IK], or the original papers [HIK03, Ulb03]. Thus, applying Proposition 5.5 with range space $L^{\tilde q}$ instead of L^q, we may use the chain rule for the composition of the two max operations in (95). This yields the assertions for a plus interval. For a minus interval, the same modifications as used to prove Lemma 7.3 apply. □

According to Proposition 6.1 we have, for all $(v,y_0) \in (X \cap U_\delta) \times \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{P}_r[v;y_0](t) = F_k(v, w_{k-1}(v,y_0))(t)\,, \quad t \in (t_k,t_{k-1})\,. \tag{96}$$

From this formula we obtain a Newton derivative of the play operator.

Theorem 7.6. *Let X denote any one of the spaces $C^{0,\alpha}[a,b]$, $0 < \alpha \le 1$, or $W^{1,p}(a,b)$, $1 < p \le \infty$. Let $u \in X$, $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $\delta > 0$ as well as the partition Δ be chosen according to Proposition 6.1. Then for every $r > 0$ the play operator*

$$\mathcal{P}_r : (X \cap U_\delta) \times \mathbb{R} \to L^q(a,b)\,, \quad 1 \le q < \infty\,, \tag{97}$$

has a Newton derivative. A particular Newton derivative is given by

$$G^r : (X \cap U_\delta) \times \mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{L}(X \times \mathbb{R}; L^q(a,b))\,, \tag{98}$$

with elements L^{P_r} of $G^r(v,y_0)$ given by

$$L^{P_r}(h,q)(t) = L(h,0)(t) + L(0, L^W_{k-1}(h,q))(t)\,, \quad t \in (t_{k-1},t_k)\,. \tag{99}$$

Here, L has the form given in Lemma 7.5, and L^W_k has the form given in Lemma 7.4. This Newton derivative is bounded on $(X \cap U_\delta) \times \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. This is a consequence of Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.5. Since there are only finitely many intervals $[t_{k-1},t_k]$, G^r is bounded. □

Since the stop operator is related to the play operator by the formula $\mathcal{S}_r[u;z_0] = u - \mathcal{P}_r[u;z_0]$, it also has a Newton derivative. We use the notations of Theorem 7.6.

Corollary 7.7. *The stop operator*

$$\mathcal{S}_r : (X \cap U_\delta) \times \mathbb{R} \to L^q(a,b)\,, \quad 1 \le q < \infty\,, \tag{100}$$

has a bounded Newton derivative with elements

$$L^{S_r}(h,q)(t) = h(t) - L^{P_r}(h,q)(t)\,, \quad t \in (a,b)\,, \tag{101}$$

at $(v, y_0) \in (X \cap U_\delta) \times \mathbb{R}$. □

8. Bouligand derivative of the play and the stop

The Bouligand derivative of the play and the stop is obtained in an analogous manner, now based on the chain rule from Proposition 3.2. We list the resulting formulas, using the notation from the previous section.

We have $\pi_r'(x;q) = q$ if $|x| < r$, or if $x = -r$ and $q > 0$, or if $x = r$ and $q < 0$; otherwise, $\pi_r'(x;q) = 0$. For the positive part $\beta(x) = x_+$ we have $\beta'(x;q) = q$ if $x > 0$, or if $x = 0$ and $q > 0$; otherwise, $\beta'(x;q) = 0$.

$$\psi_0'((u,z_0);(h,q)) = h(a) - \pi_r'(z_0;q)\,. \tag{102}$$

On a plus interval, for $k \ge 1$,

$$\psi_k'((u,p);(h,q)) = q + \beta'(\max_{s\in[t_{k-1},t_k]}(u(s) - r - p); \max_{s\in M_k(u)}(h(s) - q))\,. \tag{103}$$

On a minus interval, for $k \ge 1$,

$$\psi_k'((u,p);(h,q)) = q + \beta'(-\min_{s\in[t_{k-1},t_k]}(u(s) + r - p); \min_{s\in \widetilde{M_k}(u)}(h(s) - q))\,. \tag{104}$$

Concerning the mappings w_k,

$$w_0'((u,z_0);(h,q)) = h(a) - \pi_r'(z_0;q)\,, \tag{105}$$

and for $k \ge 1$,

$$w_k'((u,z_0);(h,q)) = \psi_k'((u, w_{k-1}(u,z_0)); (h, w_{k-1}'((u,z_0);(h,q))))\,. \tag{106}$$

Concerning the mappings F_k, $F_0' = w_0'$ since $F_0 = w_0$. For $k \ge 1$, on a plus interval with $M_{k,t}$ from (92),

$$F_k'((u,p);(h,q))(t) = q + \beta'(\max_{s\in[t_{k-1},t]}(u(s) - r - p); \max_{s\in M_{k,t}(u)}(h(s) - q))\,, \tag{107}$$

and on a minus interval with $M_{k,t}$ from (94),

$$F_k'((u,p);(h,q))(t) = q + \beta'(-\min_{s\in[t_{k-1},t]}(u(s) + r - p); \min_{s\in M_{k,t}(u)}(h(s) - q))\,. \tag{108}$$

Finally, according to (96), for $t \in (t_{k-1}, t_k)$

$$\mathcal{P}_r'[[u;z_0];[h;q]](t) = F_k'((u, w_{k-1}(u,z_0)); (h, w_{k-1}'((u,z_0);(h,q))))(t)\,. \tag{109}$$

9. Refined Newton and Bouligand differentiability

As a result of investigating above the maximum and the accumulated maximum, we have seen that these operators satisfy a slightly stronger version of Newton and Bouligand differentiability. With regard to the former, for $F : U \to Y$, $U \subset X$ open, we have constructed a Newton derivative $G : U \rightrightarrows Y$ with a remainder estimate of the type

$$\sup_{L \in G(u+h)} \|F(u+h) - F(u) - Lh\|_Y \le \rho_u(\|h\|_{\tilde X}) \cdot \|h\|_X \,, \tag{110}$$

where $\tilde X$ is a normed space such that $X \subset \tilde X$ with continuous embedding.

Having in mind applications to partial differential equations, we want to obtain explicitly a remainder estimate like (110) for the play operator. For this purpose, a corresponding generalization of the chain rule from Proposition 3.3 is needed.

Definition 9.1. *Let X, Y and $\tilde X$ be normed spaces with continuous embedding $X \to \tilde X$, let $F : U \to Y$ with $U \subset X$ open. A mapping $G : U \rightrightarrows \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ is called an $(X, \tilde X)$-Newton derivative of F, if for every $u \in U$ there exists a bounded nondecreasing function $\rho_u : (0, \delta_0) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\rho_u(\lambda) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$, such that*

$$\sup_{L \in G(u+h)} \|F(u+h) - F(u) - Lh\|_Y \le \rho_u(\|h\|_{\tilde X}) \cdot \|h\|_X \tag{111}$$

for every $h \in X$ with $u + h \in U$.

The directional derivative $F'(u; h)$ is called an $(X, \tilde X)$-Bouligand derivative, if

$$\sup_{L \in G(u+h)} \|F(u+h) - F(u) - F'(u;h)\|_Y \le \rho_u(\|h\|_{\tilde X}) \cdot \|h\|_X \tag{112}$$

for every $h \in X$ with $u + h \in U$. □

Since $\rho_u(\|h\|_{\tilde X}) \le \rho_u(c\|h\|_X)$ for some constant c, every $(X, \tilde X)$-Newton derivative of F is also a Newton derivative of F as defined in 2.3.

The following proposition shows that the chain rule remains valid for the notion of an $(X, \tilde X)$-Newton derivative. It reduces to the standard one, Proposition 3.3, whenever $\tilde X = X$ and $\tilde Y = Y$.

Proposition 9.2. *Let X, Y, Z and $\tilde X, \tilde Y$ be normed spaces with continuous embeddings $X \subset \tilde X$ and $Y \subset \tilde Y$. Let $U \subset X$ and $V \subset Y$ be open. Let $F_1 : U \to Y$ with $F_1(U) \subset V$ and $F_2 : V \to Z$ be given. Assume that F_1 and F_2 are locally Lipschitz and possess $(X, \tilde X)$- resp. $(Y, \tilde Y)$-Newton derivatives $G_1 : U \rightrightarrows Y$ resp. $G_2 : V \rightrightarrows Z$, let G_2 be locally bounded. Assume moreover that $F_1 : (U, \|\cdot\|_{\tilde X}) \to (Y, \|\cdot\|_{\tilde Y})$ is continuous. Then*

$$(G_2 \circ G_1)(u) = \{L_2 \circ L_1 : L_1 \in G_1(u), L_2 \in G_2(F_1(u))\} \tag{113}$$

defines an $(X, \tilde X)$-Newton derivative $G_2 \circ G_1 : U \rightrightarrows Z$ of $F_2 \circ F_1$.

Proof. Let $u \in U$, $h \in X$ with $u + h \in U$, set $k = F_1(u + h) - F_1(u)$. Let $L_1 \in G_1(u + h)$, $L_2 \in G_2(F_1(u + h)) = G_2(F_1(u) + k)$. By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(F_2 \circ F_1)(u+h) - (F_2 \circ F_1)(u) - (L_2 \circ L_1)h\|_Z \\ &\qquad \le \|F_2(F_1(u) + k) - F_2(F_1(u)) - L_2 k\|_Z + \|L_2(k - L_1 h)\|_Z \end{aligned} \tag{114}$$

Since G_2 is locally bounded, there exists a $C > 0$ such that for sufficiently small $\|h\|_X$ we have $\|L_2\| \le C$ for all $L_2 \in G_2(F_1(u+h))$. Consequently, for all such h and L_2, and for all $L_1 \in G_1(u+h)$ we have by assumption on F_1

$$\|L_2(k - L_1 h)\|_Z \le C\|F_1(u+h) - F_1(u) - L_1 h\|_Y \le C\rho_u(\|h\|_{\tilde{X}}) \cdot \|h\|_X \,. \quad (115)$$

Moreover, by assumption on F_2

$$\|F_2(F_1(u)+k) - F_2(F_1(u)) - L_2 k\|_Z \le \rho_{F_1(u)}(\|k\|_{\tilde{Y}}) \cdot \|k\|_Y \,. \quad (116)$$

Since F_1 is locally Lipschitz, $\|k\|_Y \le C_1\|h\|_X$ for small enough $\|h\|_X$.

Now let us define $\tilde{\rho} : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\tilde{\rho}(\lambda) = \sup\{\|F_1(u+h) - F_1(u)\|_{\tilde{Y}} : \|h\|_{\tilde{X}} \le \lambda\} \,. \quad (117)$$

By assumption on F_1, $\tilde{\rho}(\lambda) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$. Putting together the estimates obtained so far, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(F_2 \circ F_1)(u+h) - (F_2 \circ F_1)(u) - (L_2 \circ L_1)h\|_Z \\ &\qquad \le \big(C_1\rho_{F_1(u)}(\tilde{\rho}(\|h\|_{\tilde{X}})) + C\rho_u(\|h\|_{\tilde{X}})\big) \cdot \|h\|_X \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

independent from the choice of L_1 and L_2, as long as $\|h\|_X$ is sufficiently small. Setting

$$\rho(\lambda) = C_1\rho_{F_1(u)}(\tilde{\rho}(\lambda)) + C\rho_u(\lambda)$$

we have $\rho(\lambda) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$. Thus, it follows from (117) that $G_2 \circ G_1$ is an $(X, \tilde{X})$-Newton derivative of $F_2 \circ F_1$. □

The chain rule for the $(X, \tilde{X})$-Bouligand derivative follows.

Proposition 9.3. *Let X, Y, Z and $\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}$ be normed spaces with continuous embeddings $X \subset \tilde{X}$ and $Y \subset \tilde{Y}$. Let $U \subset X$ and $V \subset Y$ be open. Let $F_1 : U \to Y$ with $F_1(U) \subset V$ and $F_2 : V \to Z$ be given. Assume that F_1 and F_2 are locally Lipschitz and possess $(X, \tilde{X})$- resp. $(Y, \tilde{Y})$-Bouligand derivatives. Assume moreover that $F_1 : (U, \|\cdot\|_{\tilde{X}}) \to (Y, \|\cdot\|_{\tilde{Y}})$ is continuous. Then*

$$(F_2 \circ F_1)'(u; h) = F_2'(F_1(u); F_1'(u; h)) \quad (119)$$

is an $(X, \tilde{X})$-Bouligand derivative of $F_2 \circ F_1$.

Proof. $F_2 \circ F_1$ is Hadamard differentiable by Lemma 2.2, and the chain rule holds. It remains to show that the derivative of $F_2 \circ F_1$ is $(X, \tilde{X})$-Bouligand. Let $u \in U$, $h \in X$ with $u + h \in U$, set $k = F_1(u+h) - F(u)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} F_2(F_1(u+h)) - F_2(F_1(u)) - F_2'(F_1(u); F_1'(u; h)) = \\ \big(F_2(F_1(u)+k) - F_2(F_1(u)) - F_2'(F_1(u); k))\big) \\ + \big(F_2'(F_1(u); k)) - F_2'(F_1(u); F_1'(u; h))\big) \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

Let C_i be local Lipschitz constants for F_i. The inequality

$$C_2\|k - F_1'(u; h))\|_X \le C_2\rho_u(\|h\|_{\tilde{X}})\|h\|_X \quad (121)$$

yields an estimate for the second term on the right side of (120); the first term is estimated by

$$\rho_{F_1(u)}(\|k\|_{\tilde{Y}}) \cdot \|k\|_Y \,. \quad (122)$$

Since $\|k\|_Y \le C_1\|h\|_X$, we argue as in the proof of Proposition 9.2 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|(F_2\circ F_1)(u+h)-(F_2\circ F_1)(u)-F_2'(F_1(u);F_1'(u;h))\|_Z\\ \le \big(C_1\rho_{F_1(u)}(\tilde\rho(\|h\|_{\tilde X}))+C_2\rho_u(\|h\|_{\tilde X})\big)\cdot\|h\|_X\end{aligned} \tag{123}$$

which implies the assertion. □

Proposition 9.4. *(i) The Newton derivative G^r of the play operator $\mathcal{P}_r$ given in Theorem 7.6 has the following additional property. For every $u\in X$ there exists $\rho_u:\mathbb{R}_+\to\mathbb{R}_+$, non-decreasing and bounded, with $\rho_u(\delta)\downarrow 0$ as $\delta\downarrow 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{P}_r[u+h;z_0+q]-\mathcal{P}_r[u;z_0]-L^{P_r}(h,q)\|_{L^q(a,\gamma)}\\ \le \rho_u(\|h\|_{C[a,\gamma]}+|q|)\cdot(\|h\|_{X_\gamma}+|q|)\end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

holds for all $h\in X$, $L^{P_r}\in G^r[u+h;z_0+q]$ and $\gamma\in(a,b]$. Here we have set $X_\gamma=C^{0,\alpha}[a,\gamma]$ resp. $X_\gamma=W^{1,p}[a,\gamma]$.
(ii) The Bouligand derivative of the play operator $\mathcal{P}_r$ given in (109) has the following additional property.

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{P}_r[u+h;z_0+q]-\mathcal{P}_r[u;z_0]-\mathcal{P}_r'([u;z_0];[h;q])\|_{L^q(a,\gamma)}\\ \le \rho_u(\|h\|_{C[a,\gamma]}+|q|)\cdot(\|h\|_{X_\gamma}+|q|)\end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

holds for all $h\in X$ and all $\gamma\in(a,b]$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the result for the case $\gamma=b$. Indeed, due to the Volterra property of $\mathcal{P}_r$ and L^{P_r}, the expressions on the left side of (124) and (125), respectively, remain unchanged if we modify h on $(\gamma,b]$; therefore we obtain the assertions on $[a,\gamma]$ from those on $[a,b]$ by applying the latter to variations $h\cdot 1_{[a,\gamma]}$ instead of h.

So, let $\gamma=b$. In the previous section, we have seen how the play operator can be represented locally as a composition of mappings which are linear or given by the maximum on an interval, the accumulated maximum on an interval, or the positive part on an interval. Thus, one has to check successively that one can apply the chain rule from Proposition 9.2 to the constructions in Lemma 7.2, Lemma 7.3, Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.5.

The mapping ψ_k, considered in Lemma 7.2 and Lemma 7.3, arises according to (75) from the composition

$$\begin{aligned}(v,p)\mapsto(v-r-p,p)\mapsto(\max_{[t_{k-1},t_k]}(v-r-p),p)\\ \mapsto p+\max\{0,\max_{[t_{k-1},t_k]}(v-r-p)\}\,,\end{aligned}$$

in terms of spaces

$$(X\times\mathbb{R},\tilde X\times\mathbb{R})\to(X\times\mathbb{R},\tilde X\times\mathbb{R})\to\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$$

with $\tilde X=C[a,b]$. (A pair refers to the pairings in Definition 9.1, a single space stands for a pairing of this space with itself.) Analogously, according to (73) the mapping w_k arises from the composition

$$(X\times(X\times\mathbb{R}),\tilde X\times(\tilde X\times\mathbb{R}))\to(X\times\mathbb{R},\tilde X\times\mathbb{R})\to\mathbb{R}\,,$$

and F_k arises due to (95) from the composition

$$(X\times\mathbb{R},\tilde X\times\mathbb{R})\to(X\times\mathbb{R},\tilde X\times\mathbb{R})\to L^{\tilde q}(a,b)\times\mathbb{R}\to L^q(a,b)\,.$$

In all those cases, one checks that the assumptions of Propositions 9.2 and 9.3 are satisfied. □

References

[BoS] J.F. Bonnans, A. Shapiro, *Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems*, Springer, New York, 2000.

[BK] M. Brokate, P. Krejci, Weak Differentiability of Scalar Hysteresis Operators, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **35** (2015), 2405-2421.

[BS] M. Brokate, J. Sprekels, *Hysteresis and Phase Transitions*, Springer, New York, 1996.

[Gir] I.V. Girsanov, *Lectures on Mathematical Theory of Extremum Problems*, Springer, Berlin, 1972.

[HIK03] M. Hintermüller, K. Ito, K. Kunisch, The primal-dual active set strategy as a semismooth Newton method, *SIAM J. Opt.* **13** (2003), 865-888.

[HK09] M. Hintermüller, K. Kunisch, PDE-constrained optimization subject to pointwise constraints on the control, the state, and its derivatives, *SIAM J. Opt.* **20** (2009), 1133-1156.

[IK] K. Ito, K. Kunisch, *Lagrange Multiplier Approach to Variational Problems and Applications*, SIAM Series Advances in Design and Control, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2008.

[KDE70] M. A. Krasnosel'skiĭ, B. M. Darinskiĭ, I. V. Emelin, P. P. Zabrejko, E. A. Lifshits and A. V. Pokrovskiĭ, An operator-hysterant, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **190** (1970), 34-37; *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **11** (1970), 29-33.

[K] P. Krejčí, *Hysteresis, Convexity and Dissipation in Hyperbolic Equations*, Gakkōtosho, Tokyo, 1996.

[Ulb03] M. Ulbrich, Semismooth Newton methods for operator equations in function spaces, *SIAM J. Optim.* **13** (2003), 805-841.

[Ulb11] M. Ulbrich, *Semismooth Newton Methods for Variational Inequalities and Constrained Optimization Problems in Function Spaces*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2011.

[MR] A. Mielke, T. Roubíček, *Rate-Independent Systems*, Springer 2015.

[SS14] I. Smears, E. Süli, Discontinuous Galerkin finite element approximation of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations with Cordes coefficients, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **52** (2014), 993-1016.

[Vis] A. Visintin, *Differential Models of Hysteresis*, Springer, Berlin, 1994.

Martin Brokate

Dept. of Mathematics, Technical University of Munich, Boltzmannstr. 3, D-85747 Garching, Germany

E-mail address: brokate@ma.tum.de